EXHIBIT 1

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3	HONORABLE MARIANA R. PFAELZER, JUDGE PRESIDING
4	
5	
6	IN RE COUNTRYWIDE FINANCIAL)
7	CORPORATION SECURITIES) No. CV 07-05295 MRP (MANx)
8	LITIGATION.)
9)
10	<u> </u>
11	
12	
13	
14	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AND
15	ALLOCATION OF NET SETTLEMENT FUNDS AND
16	PETITION OF LEAD COUNSEL FOR LEAD PLAINTIFFS FOR AN AWARD OF ATTORNEY'S FEES AND REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES
17	LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA
18	FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2011; 1:06 P.M.
19	
20	
21	LEANDRA AMBER, CSR 12070, RPR OFFICIAL U.S. DISTRICT COURT REPORTER
22	312 NORTH SPRING STREET, # 408 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
23	www.leandraamber.com (213) 894-6603
24	(213) 034-0003
25	

the members of the class as a result of the SEC's action against and settlement with Defendants Mozilo, Sambol, and Sieracki. I applaud that conclusion.

The Court also looked and thought about on many occasions the strength of the plaintiffs' case and the problems they would face if the litigation goes on.

I agree with Mr. -- with what Mr. Hennigan said.

This is a very big case. And while it struck me as being one that would move along efficiently, I never underestimated how large it would become. It became very large indeed.

And the Court has acknowledged that -- on several occasions that the issues that were raised by defense, particularly with respect to loss causation and damages, gave both the Court -- and I would think a jury in particular -- considerable obstacles to the plaintiff's recovery.

Both parties have respected expert witnesses, as Mr. Bernstein pointed out, that will each present, if the matter goes to trial, conflicting testimony about the effect of Countrywide's corrective disclosures on Countrywide's share price.

I agree with what you said for the defense. It was a -- particularly the class period covers a very chaotic period of time in the market and in the economy that created a tremendous amount of uncertainty in the case whether -- and to what extent a jury would find -- would be able to agree on

01:18:225

1

2

3

4

6

8

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

21

2.2

23

24

01:17:420

01:17:245

01:16:235

01:16:510

liability and, if so, what conclusion would they reach regarding the extent of the plaintiffs' damages.

1

2

3

4

6

8

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

21

2.2

23

24

01:20:285

01:20:020

01:19:445

01:18:515

01:19:110

With respect to the individual defendants and KPMG, the plaintiffs face the risk that the jury would not find the required scienter under the law, likewise the outside director defendant and Countrywide's former president, Sanford Kurland, had or would have before a jury viable due diligence defenses.

We hadn't quite gotten to that, but they would have those defenses, and they indicated that they would put them on.

There can't be any disagreement amongst you all that the litigation, though it might have seemed only lengthy at first, became very complex and expensive. It's very, very expensive to litigate a case like this. I underestimated myself what it would cost.

The defendants submitted a voluminous summary judgment briefing which was of a very high quality. And if the case were to proceed, the plaintiffs would have been required to submit lengthy opposition briefs in response to the motions followed by replies by the defendants, which the Court has no doubt would be comprehensive and would cost a tremendous amount of money.

It would take, I think, months to complete briefing and argument on those motions and for the Court to resolve

sophisticated, and they have a large stake in the outcome. 1 2 The lead plaintiff supports this petition for fees and 3 expenses. They are satisfied. And the Court has confidence 4 in their ability to protect the interests of the class. Finally, and I'll conclude this by saying that 01:38:495 I recognize how vigorously contested every issue in this 6 7 litigation has been thus far and the fact that counsel have 8 risked the possibility that they would secure little or no return on their contention investment in the case. 01:39:120 I've got to say that at the beginning I was skeptical about some of the arguments made about the state of 11 12 the market and the economy in the period of time we're 13 looking at. I am -- I have changed my mind about that. 14 This is one -- when I rode on at first on this 01:39:425 period of time, I was very unwilling to listen to those 16 arguments. But since then, they have been so handled in such 17 a widespread manner no one can contest what that period of 18 time was like. 19 So I will conclude that the request is reasonable 01:40:120 for the fees and expenses under the PSLRA and the Ninth 21 Circuit precedent, and I will sign the proposed order. 2.2 Now, is there anything else? 23 Anyone who is a participant in this settlement 24 should be assured that this has been thus far a real fight, 01:40:525 a real legal fight, and we have a lot more to learn about the

1	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	
3	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)) ss.
4	STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
5	
6	I, LEANDRA AMBER, OFFICIAL FEDERAL COURT REPORTER, REGISTERED
7	PROFESSIONAL REPORTER, IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT
8	COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, DO HEREBY
9	CERTIFY THAT PURSUANT TO SECTION 753, TITLE 28, UNITED STATES
10	CODE, THE FOREGOING IS A TRUE AND CORRECT TRANSCRIPT OF THE
11	STENOGRAPHICALLY REPORTED PROCEEDINGS HELD IN THE
12	ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER AND THAT THE TRANSCRIPT PAGE FORMAT IS
13	IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE REGULATIONS OF THE JUDICIAL
14	CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES.
15	
16	
17	DATE:
18	
19	
20	
21	LEANDRA AMBER, CSR 12070, RPR
22	FEDERAL OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
23	
24	
25	